

REMARKS

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The Office Action dated April 5, 2006 has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

By this Response, claims 2, 4, 6, 9-10, 13-14, 18-19, 25, 33, and 37-44 have been amended, and claim 7 has been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter recited therein. No new matter has been added. Claims 2, 4, 6, 8-20, 22-27, and 31-44 are pending in the application. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the objections and rejections in view of the above amendments and the following remarks are respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, the drawings are objected to under 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a) and the specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for “a case”. Applicants have amended the claims of the application and believe no drawing corrections or further amendments are now required. Withdrawal of the drawing and specification objections is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 40-42 are objected to because of informalities. Applicants have amended claims 40-42. Accordingly, the objection is overcome. Withdrawal of the objection is requested.

In the Office Action, claims 2, 4, 6-20, 22-27 and 31-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,196,993, issued to Herron et al. (hereafter “Herron”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,422,751, issued to Lewis et al. (hereafter “Lewis”) and U.S. Patent No. 6,212,067, issued to Nakajima et al. (hereafter “Nakajima”).

Response dated July 31, 2006

Reply to Office Action dated April 3, 2006

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection because neither Herron, Lewis nor Nakajima, analyzed alone or in any combination, teaches or suggests the combined features recited in the claims of the present application. In particular, Herron, Lewis and Nakajima fail to teach a liquid crystal display apparatus including, among other features, a “hinge arm extending from the rotation axis to the enclosure, the hinge arm being positioned between the liquid crystal display module and the enclosure, wherein the liquid crystal display module, the hinge arm and the enclosure are commonly secured thereto”, as recited in independent claim 40.

Herron, Lewis and Nakajima also fail to teach a portable information processing apparatus that includes, among other features a “hinge arm extending from the rotation axis to the enclosure, the hinge arm being positioned between the liquid crystal display module and the enclosure, wherein the liquid crystal display module, the hinge arm and the enclosure are commonly secured thereto”, as recited in independent claim 41.

Herron, Lewis and Nakajima also fail to teach a portable information processing apparatus that includes, among other features, “said hinge having a hinge arm extended from the rotation axis to the enclosure to be positioned between the liquid crystal display module and the enclosure, wherein the liquid crystal display module, the hinge arm and the enclosure are commonly secured thereto”, as recited in independent claim 42.

Herron, Lewis and Nakajima also fail to teach or suggest a display for a computer that includes, among other features, a hinge “having a hinge arm extending from the rotation axis to the enclosure, the hinge arm being positioned between the display module and the enclosure, wherein the display module, the hinge arm and the enclosure are commonly secured thereto”, as recited in independent claim 43 of the present application.

Herron, Lewis and Nakajima further fail to teach or suggest a computer that includes, among other features, “a hinge arm extending from the hinge to the enclosure and positioned between the display module and the enclosure, wherein the display module, the hinge arm and enclosure are commonly secured”, as recited in independent claim 44 of the present application.

The Office Action concedes, on page 4, that Herron “fails to show the hinge having a hinge arm extended from the rotation axis to the enclosure to be positioned between the liquid crystal display module and the enclosure”. To remedy the deficient teachings of Herron, the Office Action relies upon FIGs. 8 and 9A of Nakajima. Applicants respectfully disagree and submit Nakajima fails to remedy the deficient teachings of Herron.

Applicants respectfully note the Office Action has identified, in FIGs. 8 and 9A of Herron, the hinge as element 21, the rotation axis as element 27a, and the hinge arm as element 32. However, assuming this labeling of parts, Applicants submit there is nothing in Herron to indicate the hinge arm 32 is coupled from the hinge such that all structural requirements recited in the claims of the present application would be met. Specifically, Nakajima fails to teach “the liquid crystal display module, the hinge arm and the enclosure are commonly secured thereto”, as recited in independent claims 40-42, and “the display module, the hinge arm and the enclosure are commonly secured thereto”, as recited in independent claims 43 and 44 of the present application.

The Office Action relies upon Lewis for the teaching of the use of a “single metal mounting frame within an LCD assembly having an outer plastic housing (Abstract); however, Applicants submit Lewis fails to teach the above features of claims 40-44 that would remedy the deficient teachings of Herron. As such, Lewis, like Nakajima., fails to

Response dated July 31, 2006

Reply to Office Action dated April 3, 2006

remedy the deficient teachings of Herron such that any combination of Herron, Nakajima and Lewis would provide the combined features recited in the claims of the present application.

Because no combination of Herron, Nakajima and Lewis teaches a liquid crystal display “wherein the liquid crystal display module, the hinge arm and the enclosure are commonly secured thereto, as recited in independent claim 40, a portable information processing apparatus “wherein the liquid crystal display module, the hinge arm and the enclosure are commonly secured thereto”, as recited in independent claims 41 and 42, a display for a computer “wherein the display module, the hinge arm and the enclosure are commonly secured thereto”, as recited in independent claim 43, and a computer “wherein the display module, the hinge arm and enclosure are commonly secured”, as recited in independent claim 44, independent claim 40 and its dependent claims 2, 8-11 and 37, independent claim 41 and its dependent claims 4, 12-16 and 38, independent claim 42 and its dependent claims 6, 17-20 and 39, independent claim 43 and its dependent claims 22-27, and independent claim 44 and its dependent claims 31-36 are allowable over any combination of Herron, Nakajima and Lewis. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

Applicants believe the foregoing amendments and remarks place the application in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

Response dated July 31, 2006

Reply to Office Action dated April 3, 2006

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Dated: July 31, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By Valerie P. Hayes
Valerie P. Hayes
Registration No.: 53,005
MCKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP
1900 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006
Attorney for Applicant

Application Serial No. 10/782,932

Response dated July 31, 2006

Reply to Office Action dated April 3, 2006



Attorney Docket No.: 8733.078.20

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Dated: July 31, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By Valerie P. Hayes

Valerie P. Hayes

Registration No.: 53,005

MCKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP

1900 K Street, N.W.

Washington, DC 20006

Attorney for Applicant